

### III. REMARKS

The claims have been amended extensively in order to remove the objections and rejections raised by the Examiner in the Final Rejection mailed June 18, 2003. Generic claim 1 has been replaced with new claim 46, and generic claim 17 has been completely rewritten.

New claims 47 and 48 have been introduced to specifically cover the preferred embodiments in which both of the coating layers are substantially transparent, as disclosed in the present specification such as at page 3, lines 4 and 5.

It is respectfully submitted that the present claims 2 to 48 patentably distinguish over the Curiel U.S. Patent 4,913,543 which discloses an alteration-resistant article containing variable data, such as an automobile registration plate or drivers license, containing an outer film, an adhesive layer, a hologram layer for receiving variable data thereon, and a substrate adhesively bonded to the hologram layer.

There is absolutely no disclosure or suggestion in Curiel of applying first and second optical coatings on first and second areas to an object to create first and second interference effects at the same predetermined wavelength of visible light, which interference effects are different from each other, such as one being visible to the naked eye and the other being invisible to the naked eye.

The interference effect with visible light requires that visible light must interfere with itself or with another light source. This differs from reading a text, such as a patent copy, using

visible light which reflects from the white paper background and is absorbed by the black printed text, without any interference of the visible light. Conversely, the present invention employs two coatings which preferably are transparent, such as antireflection coatings which create different interference effects at the same wavelength of visible light, to provide discernably-different images or areas on a substrate, such as from substantially transparent coatings. There is no disclosure or suggestion of such a concept in the Curiel Patent.

It is also respectfully submitted that the present method claims patentably distinguish over Curiel in view of Prince et al. and Dobrowolski. The Examiner admits that Curiel does not disclose the claimed coating methods. Prince et al. disclose and claims a process of physically-ablating a carbon layer and then discriminating by etching. This has nothing to do with the present method claims. Similarly, Dobrowolski has nothing to do with applying coatings to different areas to create different interference effects.

The Pennace Patent 5,296,949 is not pertinent to the steps of method claims 16 and 45 since it has no disclosure relating to the application of different coatings for creating different interference effects on different areas of a substrate.

Also, the other secondary references applied to the claims previous to the present amendment are not pertinent to the essential elements of the present invention as presently claimed.

The prior art of record differs critically from the present method and product claims 2 to 48 which employ at least two


different interference effects on different areas of a support to produce areas having different interference effects at the same wavelength of visible light, without any requirement for removing any portions of optical coatings. One or more coatings may be printed through a mask or aligning tray to provide a design, pattern or indicia on areas of said support, over or under areas of the other coatings, whereby some areas of the substrate are covered by superposed coatings and other areas are covered by only the printed coating. Successive layers may be applied or printed thereover to produce additional interference phenomena in addition to the contrasting interference effects provided by uncoated areas of the substrate. No removal of any essential areas of the coatings is required.

According to the preferred embodiment of the invention, the first and second areas of the substrate are coated or treated areas which produce in one of said areas an open identifier such as a trademark or trade name which is visible to the naked eye while producing in the other area a protected identifier such as the word "licensed" or a patent number, which is invisible to the naked eye but is visible under photon radiation or other radiation. This enables the manufacturer to detect counterfeit, unlicensed or otherwise unauthorized products, as disclosed at page 8, line 31, to page 9, line 5 of the specification.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

A check in the amount of \$1756.00 is enclosed for a three-month extension of time, additional claims and RCE fee. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Thomas L. Tully  
Reg. No. 19,360


Dec 18, 2003  
Date

Perman & Green, LLP  
425 Post Road  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 259-1800  
Customer No.: 2512

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Mail Stop RCE, Alexandria, VA 22213-1450

Date: 12/18/03

Signature:   
Person Making Deposit